The Times-Dispatch
DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office.....915 E. Main Street
South Richmond.....1020 Hull Street
Petersburg Bureau....109 N. Sycamore Street
Lynchburg Bureau.....215 Eighth Street

BY MAIL POSTAGE PAID	One Year.	Six Mos.	Three Mos.	One Mo.
Daily with Sunday	$6.00	$3.00	$1.50	.55
Daily without Sunday	4.00	2.00	1.00	.35
Sunday edition only	2.00	1.00	.50	.25
Weekly (Wednesday)	1.00	.50	.25	.—

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs) and Petersburg—

	One Week.
Daily with Sunday	15 cents
Daily without Sunday	10 cents
Sunday only	5 cents

Entered January 27, 1905, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SUNDAY, MAY 21, 1911.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE COURT.

When the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case was announced last week there was a general feeling that it was based upon sound legal principles, and was a fair interpretation of the act of Congress upon which the prosecution was based. If we criticized the decision at all, we should criticise it upon its inordinate length and its lack of clearness, not in the conclusion that the Court reached, but in the language in which the opinion was couched. It was claimed by Attorney-General Wickersham, after the opinion had been announced, that substantially every proposition contended for by the Government had been affirmed by the Court. In the reasoning by which the Chief Justice reached the conclusion, in which the whole Court concurred, the Chief Justice expressed the view that only contracts, combinations, etc., which in any way unreasonably or unduly restrained interstate trade and commerce, or which were unreasonably restrictive of competitive conditions, are within the prohibition of the first section of the Sherman Act. Justice Harlan dissented from this view, contending that every contract, combination, etc., which does not restrain trade and commerce is within the inhibition of the statute, but he concurred with the whole Court in the decree of affirmance. In the opinion of the Chief Justice the second section of the act seeks, if possible, to make the prohibitions of the act all the more complete and perfect by embracing all the attempts to reach the ends prohibited by the first section, that is, restraints of trade by any attempt to monopolize, even although the acts by which such results are attempted be not embraced within the general enumeration of the first section.

The objection to the decision of the Court is that too many words are used to express the meaning of the Court. For example, take this:

"The merely generic enumeration which the statute makes of the acts to which it refers and the absence of any definition of any restraint of trade as used in the statute leaves room for but one conclusion, which is, that it was expressly designed not to unduly limit the application of the act by precise definition but while clearly fixing a standard, that is, by defining the ulterior boundaries which could not be transgressed with impunity, to leave it to be determined by the light of reason, guided by the principles of law and the duty to apply and enforce the public policy embodied in the statute, in every given case whether any particular act or contract was within the contemplation of the statute."

Take this:

"If the criterion by which it is to be determined in all cases whether every contract, combination, etc., is a restraint of trade within the intendment of the law, is the direct or indirect effect of the acts involved, then, of course, the rule of reason becomes the guide, and the construction which we have given the statute, instead of being refuted by the cases relied upon is by those cases demonstrated to be correct. This is true, because as the construction which we have deduced from the history of the act and the analysis of its text is simply that in every case where it is claimed that an act or acts are in violation of the statute the rule of reason, in the light of the principles of law and the public policy which the act embodies, must be applied. From this it follows, since that rule and the result of the test as to direct or indirect, in their ultimate aspect, come to one and the same thing, that the difference between the two is therefore only that which obtains between things which do not differ at all."

We submit that the Court should have found a simpler way of expressing its opinion upon these points. The ordinary lay mind would find a great deal of difficulty in getting through the parenthetical mazes of the two excerpts we have taken from the decision of the Court. So far as possible judicial decrees should be expressed in the language of everyday life, so that they would possess the strength and satisfaction which simplicity always affords. But the decision stands, even with its waste of words, as one of the epoch-making decisions of the highest tribunal in this country.

There was much talk the next day or two after the Supreme Court had rendered its judgment of how the decision was utterly out of agreement with the views expressed by President Taft in one of his messages to the Congress upon the subject of trusts and their proper regulation and restriction. That this criticism was not justified by the facts, and that there is a remarkable agreement between the judgment of the Court and the President's discussion of the question, a plain recital of the facts will make perfectly clear.

The first section of the act condemns every contract, combination in the form of a trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of interstate or foreign trade. The second condemns every monopoly or attempt to monopolize and every combination or conspiracy with other persons to monopolize any part of interstate trade or commerce.

The Supreme Court has held in the Standard Oil case that the first section denounces contracts, combinations in the form of trusts or otherwise, or conspiracies which are an "unreasonable or undue" restraint of interstate or foreign trade.

In the Trans-Missouri Freight Association case the Supreme Court decided that a contract which limited the trading power of the railroad companies that subscribed to the contract, in the matter of rates and otherwise, was a restraint of trade within the statute. It appeared on the face of the opinion that the contract was an unreasonable restriction of the trade, but the Court took up the question whether it made any difference whether it was reasonable or not, and decided that Congress did not intend to apply the standard of reasonableness or unreasonableness, but intended to denounce all contracts in restraint of interstate trade. In a number of subsequent decisions, however, in which there was presented to the Court the question whether contracts which were actually in restraint of interstate trade were within the statute, the Court held that they were not in one or two cases, because they were indirect restraints of trade, and in other cases, because the restraints of trade were incidental, showing that the Court was not willing to hold that the literal construction of the statute was the right one. In the present decision the Court goes back and says that it would have been wiser to hold that the Court must use its reason in deciding whether a contract was within the evil aimed at by the law, and, therefore, that it might be read as if the statute contained the words "unreasonable" or "undue" before restraint of trade, but the Court, in the opinion, introduces a standard and imposes a limit in the mental process by which the Court is to decide whether a contract is reasonable or unreasonable in its restraint of trade, and that limit is that if the contract is made for the purpose of limiting production, enhancing prices, suppressing competition or establishing a monopoly, then it is unreasonable and ought to be condemned; but if the combination or contract is nothing but a normal development, with no such purposes as these, and merely for the purpose of securing economy in business, and with no circumstances tending to show a desire to enhance prices, destroy competition and oppress the public, then it may be deemed reasonable. Indeed, it seems to be a substitution of the alternative "reasonable" or "unreasonable" for the alternative "direct" or "indirect," or for the alternative "incidental" or "principal." The decision excepts from the operation of the statute restraints of trade that are reasonable, which is equivalent to the exceptions heretofore made as incidental or indirect.

The following passage has been culled out from President Taft's message as indicative of the difference between his view and that of the Supreme Court:

"Many people conducting great businesses have cherished a hope and a belief that in some way or other a line may be drawn between 'good trusts' and 'bad trusts,' and that it is possible, by amendment to the anti-trust law, to make a distinction under which good combinations may be permitted to organize, suppress competition, control prices, and do it all legally, if only they do not abuse the power by taking too great profit out of the business. They point with force to certain notorious trusts as having grown into power through criminal methods, by the use of illegal rebates and plain cheating, and by various acts utterly violative of business honesty or morality, and urge the establishment of some legal line of separation by which 'criminal trusts' of this kind can be punished, and they, on the other hand, be permitted under the law to carry on their business. Now, the public, and especially the business public, ought to rid themselves of the idea that such a distinction is practicable or can be introduced into the statute. Certainly, under the present anti-trust law, no such distinction exists. It has been proposed, however, that the word 'reasonable' should be made a part of the statute, and then that it should be left to the Court to say what is a reasonable restraint of trade, what is a reasonable suppression of competition, what is a reasonable monopoly. I venture to think that this is to put into the hands of the court a power impossible to exercise on any consistent principle which will insure the uniformity of decision essential to just judgment. It is to thrust upon the courts a burden that they have no precedents to enable them to carry, and to give them a power approaching the arbitrary, the abuse of which might involve our whole judicial system in disaster."

An examination of this will show clearly that what President Taft was dealing with was not the question of mere reasonable or unreasonable restraints of trade alone, but it was the question whether by the use of the word "reasonable" or "unreasonable," as applied not only to restraint of trade, but to the suppression of competition and monopolies, the Court should be empowered to say that there could be reasonable enhancement of prices, suppression of competition, and thus there could be a reasonable monopoly not prohibited by the statute, so that a court might say that this monopoly was reasonable because it only took 7 per cent from the public, while another monopoly, with the same methods, that took 25 per cent annually would be unreasonable. In other words, that one was a "good trust" and the other a "bad trust." That power, the President said, could never be left to the courts, and there is nothing in the Supreme Court's decision now to indicate that that power is left to the Court or assumed by it. On the contrary, the term "reasonable" and "unreasonable," which the Court has read into the statute, applies to a restraint of trade only, and not to the monopoly denounced by the statute, and the Court in effect holds that a restraint of trade in a contract or combination is necessarily unreasonable which is intended to and does result in a suppression of competition, in an enhancement of prices or in a monopoly. In other words, there is a standard for judging what is reasonable and what is unreasonable, and it is not left to the discretion of the Court to prove one thing and disprove another arbitrarily. This is a very different use of the word reasonable in the statute from the one which Mr. Taft was combatting in the language which we have quoted.

KILL OR CURE.

"Watch It Grow," is the heading of a very interesting, almost thrilling, editorial article in the current number of The Commoner. It fills nearly two columns and contains much valuable counsel as to how the Democratic party can be saved. The way is perfectly clear, the remedy is simple and for the sum of $1.00 enough of it can be bought to last for two years. There is no doubt of the efficacy of the medicine, as sixteen years of constant use in many of the best families have proved not only the courage of those who have taken it, but the thoroughness of the cures that can be directly traced to it.

Do you believe that the Democratic party should be kept free from entanglements with special interests? Take it. Are you troubled by the thought that the party representatives should mean to redeem the spirit as well as the letter of its platform pledges? Take it. The prescription is made by old Doctor William Jennings Bryan, who is so moved by consideration for the ills of others that he has given instructions that the entire stock shall be disposed of for the next two years at 50 cents on the dollar. It is growing at a spanking rate, whole families having been taken in by the printing on the labels and the Humpstones and Hungotes and Koontzes and Scogginses and Gonderziks and Rockjatdsons and Teeters from Kansas to California are watching "it grow," the same being The Commoner. "In order to place his views before a larger number of people," Dr. Bryan has determined to "do his part," so that for two years, for the price of one, the people will be able to hear him quack, quack, quack.

A SOLID DEMOCRATIC DECREE.

The Spartanburg Herald chides The Times-Dispatch because it is pleased with the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case, and says that our "admiration of the powers that be is something beautiful." That is true, because we are admonished that "the powers that be are ordained of God." There is another reason in this particular case why our admiration should have been stirred. The powers that be in this instance are largely Democratic powers. The decision of the Supreme Court was written by Chief Justice White, a Democrat of approved courage and ability, and agreeing with him were two of the Justices of the Court—Lamar, of Georgia, and Lurton, of Tennessee, both Democrats and very good Democrats at that, so that there was unanimous agreement of the Democratic bench. The decision stood 8 to 1, or in very nearly the ratio that should be satisfactory to our Spartanburg friend. On the other hand, there was the driest and most pronounced of the Republicans on the bench. Of course, our admiration for the Court is beautiful. Nearly all that we do is beautiful. Beauty is our long suit.

GOODNOW ON CITY GOVERNMENT.

The late publication of Professor Frank J. Goodnow's book on municipal government has increased interest in the problems and forms of municipal government. The book undertakes a comprehensive survey of the growth of cities, their relation to the State and the problems peculiar to themselves. The author is wedded to no special or precise form of government, and presents no body of rules to which a city must conform.

Professor Goodnow's general view is that cities are not capable by themselves of sustaining Democratic government. He accepts Professor Giddings' theory of social causation, which is that "environments rich in resources and of easy accessibility give rise to heterogeneous populations and that with a heterogeneous population the normal form of government is autocratic or oligarchical." Such is the environment of the typical American city. Therefore, Professor Goodnow contends that, if Democratic principles are maintained in the government of the city, some outside power must intervene with restraining application. Professor Goodnow, as the Boston Transcript points out, thus goes against the theory of complete home rule for cities and for the same reason he fights another prevailing position among American students—that elections should be at large, rather than by districts. If elections are held at large, a system of preferential voting should be employed, but, in general, Professor Goodnow is inclined to favor district representation in city government. He agrees with the great body of present opinion in the United States that the City Council should consist of but one chamber, and shows that this would be merely a reversion to the original American usage. On the subject of the division of the administrative and legislative functions of city government, he has no definite position to take, but favors a commission form of government if the two functions should be consolidated in a single body. His general requirements are a small number of elective offices, elections by district, simplicity of organization, a single-chamber council, the enlistment as far as possible of the unpaid services of the citizens, and a reform of taxation which will make direct taxpayers of those who now pay indirectly and unconsciously.

This is of local interest, when revision of the city charter is being considered. So far as opinion with us diverges from the idea of consolidating the two branches of the Council and leaving the form of government otherwise practically unchanged, it seems to be strongly taking the direction which leads to a government of commissioners exercising together legislative functions and doing executive duties individually as the heads of general departments of administration. The objection to this plan is that it provides too narrow an area for discussion and exchange of views and representation of varying interests which we are accustomed to think of as indispensable to a proper exercise of legislative functions. Back of "the common interest" which should be the concern of a city government are conflicting individual interests which "are to be forged into a resultant common interest." So, the municipal corporation differs from the private business corporation the government or directorate of which has to do with only a single interest common to all the members.

THE IMMIGRANT AND THE FARM.

Why do comparatively few of the 800,000 immigrants who come to America every year, most of them from rural districts of Europe, go to the country, where their labor is needed? The demand for farm labor always exceeds the supply. The demand for labor in cities is always less than the supply. Why do foreigners stick to the cities?

One answer is pointed out by the Boston Globe—that foreigners find many objections to farm life in the United States. In Europe farmers do not live on isolated farms, but in villages, each having its school, its church and its well established social life. The immigrants dislike the loneliness of the American farm. The food is different. Wages are higher and the life more healthful, but foreigners "care more for one another than for themselves," and would rather get along sociably on $5 the week than on $10 if lonesome.

Another reason why foreigners do not go into farm labor is the fact that they do not know how abundant the opportunities are. There is no systematic, co-operative effort on the part of Federal and State authorities and associations to bring the foreigners to the American farm. The foreigner has to depend in large measure upon private employment agencies. He becomes the prey of contractors, labor camps and construction companies.

THE UNIVERSAL NEED.

(Selected for The Times-Dispatch.)

"My help cometh from the Lord."—Psa. cxxi. 2.

If we ask ourselves the question as to what most of us need, we may all give very different answers, and yet what every one of us most needs is help. In the lives of different ones help may be needed in different ways, but after all it is the thing most of us need. When we enter the world as feeble infants, we need help, and on through life's entire journey we need it. None of us can fail to find ourselves dependent upon others, or upon some power that helps us. The strongest man left without food for even a few days begins to weaken. All of us are at times prone to feel we can be independent of all outside aid, but as we attempt the road of life the difficulties become greater than we ever dreamed, and even the most selfish of us, who thinks he can live to himself absolutely, will have a miserable life and a miserable death. A man who protests that he needs no help will find, as his keen brain grows feeble or some terrible sorrow darkens his life and there is none to help, that he most deeply needs the friends that he has failed to make. We need help even to make us trust and believe. There are so many mysteries and difficulties in life that the most earnest Christian is at times on the verge of doubt until help comes from "the Lord who hath made heaven and earth," the God who made us and who will not only help us to believe here while we are surrounded by mystery, but who has said, "Because I live ye shall live also." Whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die." When all around us is dark with trouble, if we only ask God to help us to trust, we will be sure to understand that the God who has made us will take care of us. The very meaning of being a Christian is not merely going to church and professing religion, but having been helped by God to trust Him in everything. It means being able to say, "I have put my affairs into God's hands, and I do not worry about them; the Lord will provide and do what is best for me if I only do my best to keep His commandments." We are mostly poor, frightened, fretful creatures, fearful of the future, and that is not believing in God. If we believe, we must put our lives and all we have into God's hands each day, live a day at a time, hand in hand with God. Whatever else we pray for, let us pray that God will help us to trust Him absolutely.

Then we must try to conquer our sins and evil habits. Where can we look for help to do this? Surely not to the world, where all is as weak and sinful as we are ourselves. A blind man does not ask another blind man to lead him, nor a wounded man does not ask help of another wounded man.

We must turn from man to God and look to Him for help to heal us from our sins. That is our greatest need. Let us cry unto the Lord and say, "Lord, be thou my helper; open mine eyes and renew a right spirit within me." Jesus will do for us what the world cannot do; every day we stay away from God we grow worse; the devil grows stronger and we grow weaker. Our desire for better things becomes more feeble, the chain of sin waxes heavier and harder. Again let us pray, "Take me by the hand, lift me up, cleanse me from my wickedness." And the good Lord will answer, "I will, be thou clean; go in peace; thy sins be forgiven thee."

George McLean, the new United States Senator from Connecticut, has been made chairman of the committee on forest reservations and protection of game, and it is a most important committee. He has introduced a bill prohibiting the killing of migratory wild fowl during certain seasons of the year under the principle of regulating interstate commerce. This is a measure which should have the unanimous support of all the members of Congress, and we are glad that Mr. McLean has taken it up.

Baltimore has raised $95,000 as a guarantee fund to secure the holding of the Democratic National Convention in that town next year. The amount required is $100,000 and the canvass for additional subscriptions will be made this week. Our neighbors have done rather better with this enterprise than the people of Richmond have done with the Northern Neck Railroad; but in one case it is politics while in the other it is pure business.

Professor W. E. Burghardt Du Bois is the subject of a most eulogistic communication in the Rocky Mountain News. The writer compares the colored professor with Jefferson, Lincoln, Booker Washington and Fred Douglass and speaks of Booker Washington's "quiescent palliatory doctrine of surrender." Du Bois is a mere mad malcontent, in no sense comparable to Booker Washington.

Even Atlanta husbands are peculiar creatures. An Atlanta court was lately called upon to require a husband to kiss his wife. It did not have jurisdiction, but Judge Orr advised the husband to kiss his wife at least once each day. What a queer species those Atlantans must be!

To long has tripe been ridiculed by unappreciative humorists. It is gratifying, therefore, that Harold Dobbler, of Staten Island, has indited an ode, con amore, to tripe. It is:

"What is it that within me drives me on
To take my pen in hand and start to write—
That makes me feel I must burst into song?
I know; I've just been feasting off of tripe.

"Tripe—tripe—ye gods and little fishes,
My very soul it seems to permeate.
I think of all the Epicurean dishes—
Tripe's got them skinned a mile right up to date."

That was nobly said, and we know will bring reminiscent tears to the eyes of the Virginian-Pilot, who, in the good old days that are gone, used to be able to store away more tripe than any other doughty trencherman in all the land.

It has been discovered that Lucrezia Borgia, the female horror, wore a hobble skirt. A word to the husbands is sufficient.

It would seem that we shall soon have to have legislation establishing a kissing limit, after the manner of a speed limit. New Jersey has already decided that ten kisses a day is the legal limit for a husband. Under the terms of an agreement filed in that State recently, with the sanction of the court, Waldo Boughrowski promised that he would not expect more than ten kisses a day from his wife, five before dinner and five after dinner. In another case, also in New Jersey, a wife had her husband before the court on a charge of excessive kissing, and the court ordered him never to kiss her except by and with her express permission, and exacted of him a bond in the sum of $100 for the faithful performance of the obligation. Colonel George Carrington Cabell, of Norfolk, has the right solution of osculatory difficulties when he suggests that men kiss each other. If the courts keep on, the men will be all left to kiss.

Are you one of Roosevelt's "cuckoo parents"?

"The Green Bag," one of the very best legal periodicals published in the English language, comes out this month with its leading article upon Captain Micajah Woods, the distinguished Virginia lawyer, who died a few months ago. The article is by R. T. W. Duke, Jr., and is a fine bit of biographical appreciation.

An ocean steamer arrived in Boston the other day, carrying in its cargo two tons of human hair from Chinese cemeteries. It will soon be seen in the form of puffs on the heads of some of our fairest but most unfashionable lasses.

This is the time of the year when a lad and a lass on a crowded excursion steamer can look at each other and feel that they are a thousand miles away from anybody.

It is hard to say whether divorce suits or damage suits against transportation corporations furnish the greater number of novelties. Rarely a day passes but something unusual in one of these lines turns up in the courts and gets into the dispatches. For instance, a New York woman sued a railroad company, because she had hiccoughs, and s cured a verdict for $1,500 damages, too. The argument of the plaintiff was that she was a passenger on one of the defendant's cars when it bumped into another car and gave her a severe jolt which started her to hiccoughing. From that time for months daily at intervals, she alleged, she was subject to severe spells of hiccoughs. The jurymen sympathized with her to the extent named.

Queen Mary will bar paint, but will allow face powder at the coronation functions. How about the stuff the women put on their eyebrows?

Daily Queries and Answers

The Cockade City.

1. Why is Petersburg, Va., called the Cockade City?
2. Of what are the levees along the Mississippi River made?

1. Because of the cockades worn by the Petersburg soldiers in the War of 1812.
2. Earth.

Best Biographies.

1. In your opinion who are the best biographers of Washington, Madison, Monroe, Andrew Jackson, Robert E. Lee? Also kindly suggest some good writings on the Revolutionary War.
2. Would it be possible for me to arrange it so I could take a negro boy from the colored reformatory of Virginia?
3. Whom did Tom S. Martin succeed as minority leader in the United States Senate?

A READER.

1. We name Owen Wister's "The Seven Ages of Washington;" "The Life of Madison," by W. C. Rives; Gilman's "Life of Monroe," in the American Statesman Series; Buell's "Andrew Jackson"; Fitzhugh Lee's biography of General R. E. Lee. For material on the Revolutionary War, read Fiske's "American Revolution," Trevelyan's "American Revolution."
2. We think not.
3. Senator Hernando De Soto Money, of Mississippi.

Peas and Beans.

Are peas and beans classed as vegetables or legumes?

Z.

Botanically both are classed as legumes, and as food for mankind they are classed as vegetables. Legume is the fruit of leguminous plants, such as peas, beans, lupines and the like, so called because they may be gathered without cutting.

The Bible in Court.

1. Why was the Holy Bible adopted by the State and United States for witnesses to be sworn by?
2. Also what religion is the nearest to the right one and state why?

B. P. H.

1. Because it was the chief religious book of the English-speaking people, used from time immemorial by the people of England.
2. This is a controversial matter which we cannot take up here.

Snails.

What will exterminate snails in a garden, or keep them out of flower beds?

S. C.

If the flower beds are surrounded by a board edging, made to stand five inches above the ground and occasionally coated with a paste made of train oil and soot, it will form a barrier over which snails cannot pass. The way to exterminate them is to find them in the early morning and kill them.

Local Option.

What is the full definition of "local option"?

It is the right or obligation of determining by popular vote within certain districts, as in each county, city or town, whether the sale of alcoholic beverages within the district shall be allowed.

POLICE ON TRAIL OF GANG OF SWINDLERS

BY LA MARQUISE DE FONTENOY.

THE police departments in this country have received a request from Berlin to be on the watch for an Englishman, who styles himself "Captain Newton," who claims to have served as an officer in the English army during the Boer War, and who is particularly well known in New York and Chicago, where he has flourished with his confederate, Baron Korff-Koenig. The latter, head of a particularly dangerous international gang of swindlers and card sharpers, and whose real name is Rudolf Stallmann, of Berlin, has just been arrested at Calcutta, on a demand for his extradition from Berlin. Count Gisbert Wolff-Metternich, nephew of the German ambassador in London, was captured at Vienna, and has been in jail for three or four months past at Berlin. In fact, the German police have the entire gang under lock and key, with the exception of the soi-disant Captain Newton. The latter's name is well known to the police of New York, and it may be remembered that a woman, described as Mrs. Newton and as his wife, became involved some years ago in a charge of theft brought against her by a New York woman living somewhere on Central Park West, and whose acquaintance she had made at Larchmont.

There are over sixty complaints recorded against the gang, of swindles of tradesmen. The charges of swindling at cards are less numerous, owing to the reluctance of the victims to make public the fact that they have been foolish enough to permit themselves to be fleeced. One of the gang now in jail is Baron Schenk Zu Schweinsburg, a perfectly authentic noble, some sixty years of age, and most respectable looking.

The impudence of the soi-disant Baron Koenig is almost beyond belief. During the last Peace Conference at The Hague, he managed to get himself invited to most of the official receptions and entertainments, and when he fleeced a young American at cards to a very large amount, and the mother of the young man, the bearer of a well known name in New York, lodged charges against him with the management of the hotel at which he was staying, and with the police, the hotel people were so impressed by him that they asked her to vacate her rooms with her son, and to leave the establishment, while the Dutch police refused to entertain the accusation.

Spain's royal house has just lost through death a species of left-hand relative, for whom it will not mourn, and whose disappearance from the scene it will regard with a sentiment of relief rather than of grief—a relative, by the by, who was an uncle of Don Giovanni del Drago, and of the latter's American wife, who was the widow of the New York brewer, Otto Schmidt. The relative in question was the Marquis of Campo Sagrado, who has just died in Asturias, and who had married Isabella, one of the sisters of the late Princess del Drago.

Both the Princess del Drago and the Marquise di Campo Sagrado were daughters of old Queen Christine of Spain, who, after the death of her husband, King Ferdinand VII., married her favorite, Fernando Munos, whom she had raised from the ranks of a private soldier in the royal guards, to be Duke of Rianzares and of Montmoret, and captain general, that is to say, field marshal of the army of Spain. She wanted to appoint him as cabinet minister and premier, but the Spanish people would not hear of it, and drove her into exile with Munos and her children by him. These children were half-brothers and half-sisters of Queen Isabella, and although the latter had been called upon to suffer much at the hands of her mother on their account, yet she treated them with characteristic generosity while on the throne. Moreover, when afterwards she resided in Paris, in virtue of exile, she repeatedly came to their financial relief, although herself constantly in monetary difficulties, by reason of her inability to understand the value of money.

When Queen Christina died in France, Isabella renounced all her rights to her mother's fortune and jewels, in order that her half-brothers and half-sisters might have more.

One of these half-sisters married the Marquis of Campo Sagrado, a secretary in the diplomatic service of Spain. He was speedily promoted, and was appointed envoy at St. Petersburg, where both he and his wife were received with exceptional distinction; he on account of his cheery disposition and his love of pleasure; she by reason of the fact that she was the daughter of a Queen, and had the blood of the royal house of Bourbon in her veins.

The marquise died in Paris, and her husband returned to St. Petersburg as a widower. There he became one of the best known and most popular figures in society, famed as a gourmet, as a bold and yet extremely clever card player, and as an expert in everything connected with the stage. His embonpoint was phenomenal, and seemed to be in keeping with his good nature and geniality.

But his extravagance, especially his losses at cards, landed him in all sorts of financial troubles. He rendered himself guilty of certain delicacies of a financial character, which his government could not overlook, and he likewise found himself overwhelmed, not only with liabilities to tradespeople, etc., but also with debts of honor, especially gambling debts.

Dismissed while still at St. Petersburg, and thus deprived of his diplomatic immunities from legal proceedings for debt, he was obliged to leave St. Petersburg secretly; not by rail, where his embonpoint would have caused him to be recognized, but by ship, from Kronstadt.

He did not return to Spain, but took up his residence in Paris, where his sister-in-law, Queen Isabella, took compassion upon him, and made him an allowance, which he is generally believed to have supplemented by considerable sums paid to him by the Russian secret service, for watching Russians of distinction either visiting or residing in the French capital.

By dint of appeals to King Alfonso, who was after a fashion his grandnephew, he managed to secure restoration to the Spanish diplomatic service, and was accredited as Spanish envoy to the Sublime Porte, where he remained until the deposition of Abdul Hamid, when the examination of the latter's secret papers showed that the marquis was heavily in the tailor's debt, and that his name figured as having received large sums on loan, and also for "services rendered", the "services" being presumably in the way of furnishing the Sultan with information concerning his colleagues and his friends at Stamboul.

These revelations of course rendered his continuance at Constantinople impossible. He was recalled, placed on the retired list with a small pension, and has now died in the little provincial town to which he had withdrawn after his recall.

There are many who will not only be interested to learn of his death, but who will even express regret. For he was so amusing a character that people never dreamt of judging him by the ordinary standard of honor and convention.

(Copyright, 1911, by the Brentwood Company.)